DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 440 EA 014 613

AUTHOR Tietze, Irene Nowell; Shakeshaft, Charol
TITLE Toward a Reconstruction of Organizational Theory: Androcentric Bias in A. H. Maslow's Theory of Human Motivation and Self-Actualization.
PUB DATE 21 Mar 82
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Need; Affiliation Need; Females; Males; *Personality Theories; Psychological Characteristics; Research Methodology; *Self Actualization; Self Esteem; *Sex Bias; Sex Role; Social Values
IDENTIFIERS *Maslow (Abraham)

ABSTRACT

An exploration in the context of feminist science of one theoretical basis of educational administration--Abraham Maslow's theory of human motivation and self-actualization--finds an androcentric bias in Maslow's methodology, philosophical underpinnings, and theory formulation. Maslow's hypothetico-deductive methodology was based on a conceptualization of human needs that found male qualities most desirable and that identified chiefly masculine goals as the goals of self-actualization. Women were seen as becoming self-actualized by achieving male goals. Maslow's sampling of self-actualizing people was biased since his sample was predominantly male. The validity of his data is difficult to assess because the data came from observation and from interviews for which there are no transcripts. The generalizability of Maslow's findings is suspect because his sample was biased. Maslow's interpretation of his results creates a model in which male values predominate, the ranking of human needs (affiliation, self-esteem, and self-actualization) is male-oriented, and most characteristics of the self-actualizing person are masculine and centered on the individual. An alternative view of female self-actualization, based on histories of two women's communities, emphasizes such values as group orientation, affiliation, emotional maintenance, development of self and individual talents, and empathy. (Author/RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216440

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charol Shakeshaft

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Toward a Reconstruction of Organizational Theory: Androcentric Bias in A. H. Maslow's Theory of Human Motivation and Self-Actualization

by

Irene Nowell Tietze
and
Charol Shakeshaft

Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York 11550

Paper Presented at the
Annual Meeting
of the
American Educational Research Association

New York
21 March 1982

EA 014 613

DRAFT: DO NOT QUOTE OR REPRINT WITHOUT PERMISSION
COPYRIGHT © 1982

Bias is a four-letter word. Researchers often are alert to the biases in their methodologies which might invalidate their work. Much has been written on bias in design, sampling procedures, measurement and validity, and generalizability and interpretation of results. Guidleines are available to researchers to aid them in eliminating or correcting for various elements in research design which might produce biased data.

While biases in experimenter/observer effects or sample selection, for example, may be apparent to both the researcher and the consumer of research, a more subtle and less apparent bias may lie in the initial conceptualization of the research problem. To this end, scholars in many fields now are questioning the theoretical constructs which undergird their disciplines. It is no longer sufficient to point out the single sex/race/age sample or overgeneralizability of a study, for example, without retracing these faults to the conceptualization process which precedes the research design.

Recent attention has focused on the sexist/androcentric perceptions which have dominated the conduct of inquiry. (See Adkison, 1981; Campbell, 1981; Kanter, 1977; Intriligator, 1981; Shakeshaft, 1979, 1981; Shakeshaft & Hanson, 1981; Stewart, 1978; and Wallston, 1981.) The terms sexism and androcentrism, although related, have their distinctions.

> Sexism refers to a way of viewing the world in which: differences between men and women, actual or alleged, are perceived as profoundly relevant to important political, economic, and social arrangements and behavior. (Ruth, 1980, p. 53)

Sexism gives the impression that modal male behavior is somehow superior (Parker & Parker, 1979). It is an intentional and direct bias, a bias of commission.

Androcentrism or masculism is the elevation of the masculine to the level of the universal and the ideal. It is an honoring and valuing of men and the male principle above women and the female (Ruth, 1980). It is an indirect and subtle bias, a bias of omission.

The essence of both sexism and androcentrism is the evaluative element of ranking males above females. This perception creates a belief in male superiority/supremacy and a masculine value system in which traditional female values, experiences, and behaviors are viewed as inferior, or not quite human (Slocum, 1980; Stockard & Johnson, 1979).

It is not surprising, then, that these beliefs and values held by men have generated a patriarchal research paradigm (Wallston, 1981; Westkott, 1979) controlled by men. This paradigm has led to inquiries which have focused primarialy on the problems,

interests, and achievements of men; have used only men as the subjects of research; and have given rise to a world view which holds men and male characteristics as the norm (Sherman & Beck, 1979; Stewart, 1978).

Feminist scholars are calling for a new paradigm in social science research, "a rupture in consciousness" (Smith, 1979, p. 138) which relates to and incorporates female experience (Gilligan, 1979; Ruth, 1980; Shakeshaft, 1979; Sherman & Beck, 1979). They seek to replace patriscience with a new vision, a feminist/scientific method which would examine not only female experience but also the context of female experience (Segerberg, 1979), i.e., a woman functioning in the female world and the male world (Bernard, 1981), a woman-identified woman (Ruth, 1980) rather than a man-identified woman.

As yet no attempt has been made to analyze for androcentric bias the theoretical underpinnings of organizational behavior as applied to educational administration. The intent of this study is to explore the theoretical bases of educational administration in the context of feminist/science. This critique will identify the omissions and distortions which result when a disproportionate share of theory formulations is viewed solely through the male prism.

This paper rivets attention on a particular theory which

has been applied and used in education, industry, religion, organization and management, psychotherapy, and self-improvement. Since its inception in 1943, this theory has become a psychological classic. Indeed, it has fostered a revolution in personology, the study of personality syndromes and behavior, as applied to individuals, organizations, and societies. The studies, articles, books, and journals based on this theoretical model are legion.

The pervasiveness of this theory in works dealing with organizational behavior was evidenced by a study which sampled nine texts used in college-level preparatory programs in educational administration (Tietze, Shakeshaft, & Davis, 1981). This theory was found to be quoted, discussed, elaborated upon or referred to in a majority of the texts. It is Maslow's Theory of Human Motivation and Self-Actualization.

An application of the principles of feminism/science (Eichler, 1980) to Maslow's theory uncovered androcentric bias in all elements of his work. In addition to biased methods and the use of sexist language throughout, Maslow's androcentric bias surfaced in philosophical underpinnings and theory formulation. Maslow implicitly adopted male values and norms in his conceptualization process and then fashioned a male theoretical model out of "masculine cloth" (Gilligan, 1979, p. 432).

This paper will address the issues of that bias and will demonstrate that neither Maslow's understanding of motivation nor the design of his theoretical model has revelance to "half the human experience" (Hyde & Rosenberg, 1980, p. v).

Maslow's Methodology

Maslow's theoretical model, the hierarchy of needs, and its ensuing theory of self-actualization have been criticized for lack of laboratory and empirical data (Frick, 1971; Maddi & Costa, 1972). Maslow himself addressed this issue repeatedly and countered accusations of experimental invalidity and unscientific procedures by saying that what he sought to measure was the essence of people's lives. He argued that this essence could not be contained in a laboratory setting (Maslow, 1970), that such measuring required naturalistic observation, i.e., "a life situation of the total human being in his [sic] social environment" (Maslow, 1970, p. xii).

Researchers long have waged the misdirected battle over quantitative/qualitative, hard/soft, wet/dry data (Bogdan, 1980; Eisner, 1981; Reinharz, 1979). We consider this methodological controversy to be a moot issue in this critique of Maslow's work, as well as in any other discussion. We are concerned with guiding principles and underlying assumptions. What prompted Maslow to initiate his research? Where did he look for information? Whom

did he focus on? How did he formulate his theory?

From our survey of Maslow's literature, we have determined that Maslow's research can be characterized as the "hypothetico-deductive method" (Kaplan, 1964, p. 9). This is a reconstructive method whereby:

> a combination of careful observations, shrewd guesses, and scientific intuition arrives at a set of postulates governing phenomena of interest; from these are deduced observable consequences. (Kaplan, 1964, p 9)

Maslow began his research as a personal quest. He was interested in the personalities of two of his professors, Ruth Benedict and Max Wertheimer (Frick, 1971), who had made a profound impression upon Maslow in his student years. He made an attempt to understand them by observing and noting their behaviors and attitudes. An analysis of these yeilded a composite picture of certain characteristics common to both. Maslow sought to apply these observations to other individuals and, thus, began his studies of self-actualization (Frick, 1971; Goble, 1970).

This abstraction of mental concepts and observables combined yielded Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Willer, 1971). This model put forward the thesis that human needs are hierarchically arranged in a system of prepotency from lower to higher (Lowry, 1973). The highest level of this hierarchy deals with self-actu-

alization; the full use of a person's talents, capabilities, and potentialities (Maslow, 1970).

Androcentric Conceptualization

Maslow's theory of personality has been called by Williams in her book, Psychology of Women (1977), an "androgynous model of personality" (p. 342). She sees Maslow's concept of the healthy personality as one which is independent of sexual identity. Heckerman, in The Evolving Female (1980), equates the values and goals of humanists such as Maslow with those of the women's movement. "Both emphasize removing the barriers toward growth" (p. 136).

Williams goes on to state that the healthy woman can be: high in self-esteem, assertive, willing to take the initiative, self-reliant, independent, and ambitious; all traditional male sex-role traits. She feels that these traits are not incongruous with those of empathy and concern, which usually are attributed to the female sex-role.

It is important to focus here on "barriers toward growth" and "the healthy woman." By Maslow's criteria, self-actualizing persons are healthy people. If this is so, does one infer that women who are not high in self-esteem, assertiveness, decisiveness, etc. are not self-actualizing and thus are "unhealthy"? Or that women were not able to grow before the onset of women's liberation?

Such a global embracing of Maslow's theory is possible only if

one partakes of the system of beliefs which posits that what is prized by the male sex is prized also by the female sex. This concept of male superiority/supremacy (Parker & Parker, 1979; Stockard & Johnson, 1979) undergirds Maslow's whole theory and theoretical framework.

Let us attempt to reconstruct from Maslow's writings what his stimulus was for beginning his research on motivation and personality.

One of the two people who provided impetus for Maslow's work was Ruth Benedict.[1] One can surmise that it was the probable impact of Benedict's tutelage on Maslow which led him to conceive of self-actualization as a theory of full personhood comprised of both sexes. If we examine Benedict's life, a picture emerges of an intelligent, hard-working, independent, ambitious individual whose great passion was anthropology. The quality of Benedict's work garnered her numerous honors. She was made editor of the "Journal of American Folklore," received a large and prestigious grant from the Office of Naval Research, was appointed a full professor by Columbia, and became president of the American Anthropological Association (James, et al, 1971).

---

1 Although Maslow never actually named Benedict as one of his self-actualizing cases, he alludes to her inclusion in his contemporary cases in an interview with Frick (1971) in which he states, "... this self-actualization idea came from simply loving and admiring two people in particular... One was Ruth Benedict..." (p. 21).

Of great interest is the image of Ruth Benedict, a female in a non-traditional role. Although women did teach and did make contributions to science, precious few had the rewards of the scientific patriarchy bestowed upon them (however deserved they might have been) as Benedict had. Clearly then, Benedict was a woman who had arrived in the male world. She was a success, a healthy person, a self-actualizer. Ruth Benedict was a woman who had reached the top of her profession by working within male definitions and conforming to male criteria (Adkison, 1981).

This view of the fully self-actualized female in Maslow's conceptualization as one who makes it in a man's world is echoed in a piece he authored in 1968. In addressing his comment to the fact that most Utopias are patriarchal, Maslow notes,

> Now that females, at least in the advanced countries, have been emancipated and self-actualization is possible for them also, how will this change the relationship between the sexes? (p. 149)

Here Maslow alludes to the fact that the opportunities for and avenues to self-actualization, which for so long had been a male privilege, were now avaliable to women who wanted to achieve in the same ways. What Maslow totally disregards is that masculine means to and ends of self-actualization may not be the choices of females. A female utopia would not necessarily be based on "the

masculine ethic" (Kanter, 1975, p. 43).

A corollary to Maslow's conceptualization of woman in a man's world is that of the "women's sphere" (Bernard, 1981, p. 80). "Women's sphere," engendered in the nineteenth century, connotes a territoriality separate from the male world and populated by women. Within this sphere, women functioned under a prescribed set of rules as to the appropriate behavior of females. Thus, the women's sphere covered household management, mate-servicing, nurturance, upholding of morals, child-bearing/raising, and all manner of emotional sustenance (Bernard, 1981). Teaching, writing, and moral reform were countenanced because they performed the same kind of moralizing function as women's domestic work (Bernard, 1981).

Although this "cult of domesticity" (Barnard, 1981, p. 87) has deteriorated since the turn of the century, many vestiges remain. Traditional psychology has presumed that "the masculine male and the feminine female are the models of 'healthy' behavior" (Vaughter, 1976). This androcentric bias of woman in woman's place prevails in Maslow's (1970) descriptions of the self-actualizing female as "especially equipped socially" (p. 166), "an ideal mother" (p. 47), and "not defensive about being female or about any of the female functions" (p. 157). These characteristics are sex-specific and not ones Maslow uses to describe self-actualizing males.

In addition, the female examples Maslow chose as partial cases

and potential cases of self-actualization reflect the androcentric bias of the "women's sphere." The four women listed, Eleanor Roosevelt, Jane Addams, Harriet Tubman, and Ida M. Tarbell, all were involved in the causes of social reform. Philanthrophy was consonant with women's place. Antislavery societies, settlement houses, temperance work, labor reform, and human rights legislation were expressions of the ultimate work of the female world: love/duty/taking care of others/doing good. These activities were both outside the mainstream of the male world and beneath its dignity (Bernard, 1981).

Maslow never explored the differences between the public world of men and the private world of women. Thus, his approach reinforces the androcentric view of "man's world, woman's place" (Janeway, 1971). Self-actualization according to Maslow was possible for females if women: 1. opted to function in the male milieu and adopted male modes of behavior and valuing, or 2. stayed within the boundaries of patriarchal convention and the code of feminine behavior.

These two positions of woman in woman's place and woman in man's world coalesce in Maslow's introduction to his opus Motivation and Personality (1970).

> It is possible for a woman to have all the specifically female fulfillments (being loved, having the home, having the baby) and then, without giving up any of the satis-

> factions already achieved, go on beyond femaleness to the full humanness that she shares with males, for example, the full development of her intelligence, of any talents that she may have, and of her own particular idiosyncratic genius, of her own individual fulfillment. (p. xvii, emphasis Maslow's)

Aside from the disturbing inference one draws from this statement that female work does not require excessive amounts of intelligence, talent, or genius, Maslow, in effect, is devaluing the female experience. He espouses male superiority by encouraging females to reach further once their "feminine" fulfillments are complete. Meaningful self-actualization for men, however, cannot be accomplished through women's work. Maslow does not exhort males to go beyond their maleness to self-actualization since, to borrow from Jerzy Kozinski, being male is being there. Maslow's implication is this: "Excellence in humanity is, therefore, excellence in masculinity" (Ruth, 1980, p. 45).

It is evident from Maslow's writings that he was perplexed about women's roles. He sends many conflicting messages. On the one hand, he puts forth the ideas that women can reach self-actualization by performing motherly/domestic/service duties. Conversely, he contends that women can attain full-humanness by appropriating male methods of self-actualization. A further confusion

is his invitation to women to embrace both styles; to piggyback male modes atop female ones. This mixture of incongruous elements in defining self-actualization for women reveals an imprecise and imbalanced conceptualization in Maslow's theory formulation; the fundamental basis of which is androcentric bias.

Androcentric Sampling

Maddi and Costa in Humanism and Personology write, "Maslow focused upon 'great men'" (p.101). Of the 46 cases, partial cases, and potential cases listed by Maslow, 42 were male. Maslow sought to examine the "growing tip" (Hall, 1968), the fraction of one-percent of the total population who were the self-actualizing type. Respect for privacy prevented him from disclosing the names of his contemporaries whom he considered to be self-actualizing, so Maslow looked to reknowned figures of the past and examined the letters, biographies, and documents by and about them (Maslow, 1973).

We know that historically women have been denied access to the vehicles to public acclaim, and that their achievements were considered less meritorious than men's. Therefore, it is not surprising to find Maslow's sample is predominantly male. It has not been until the recent decade that the history of women has been reconstructed. Lack of historic testimony, however, does not mitigate Maslow's failure to mention this limitation in his study.

Due to the minute portion of self-actualizing subjects available in the public domain, Maslow trained his eye on 3,000 college students. This screening yielded only one usuable subject and a dozen or two possible future subjects (Maslow, 1973).

Maslow's data was collected in the late 1940s. The college population at that time was predominantly male, and thus androcentric bias (in addition to class and race bias) was exacerabated by the exclusive use of college students as subjects (Sherman & Denmark, 1978). Again Maslow did not address this limitation of his study.

One must call into question Maslow's nearly total neglect of the female population and wonder what, if any, input women and women's experience had into his theory formulation, both directly as subjects and indirectly in his conceptualization. For a theory which is supposedly "sex neutral" (Gilligan, 1979), Maslow's Theory of Human Motivation and Self-Actualization is overwhelmingly one-sexed.

Androcentrism in Validity Issues

As mentioned before, Maslow's study followed the hypothetico-deductive method. As such, he employed no tests or experiments with his subjects. The little information we have regarding his observational techniques with living subjects informs us that he

conducted open-ended interviews, often on a social basis (Maslow, 1973).

We do not consider this a validity problem since interviewing has viability in terms of naturalistic observation. The total absence, however, of any transcripts of these interviews does not allow one to evaluate the substance of his data. One can only assume that the topics Maslow pursued and the content he heard were filtered through his perceptions, ideas, and imaginative stirrings.

Some comments by Willer from The Social Determination of Knowledge (1971) are of import here:

> The theoretical definition of systems of knowledge will begin with the question: from what point of view (or system of knowledge) are events observed?...perception from a viewpoint of a system of knowledge would affect observation and consequent action...A belief is either consistent or inconsistent with a system of knowledge, and what is regarded as 'true' in terms of one system may be 'false' for another. (p. 7)

This last comment is especially significant in terms of feminism/science.

Androcentrism in Generalizability and Interpretation of Results

Extreme caution must be exercised concerning the generalizability of Maslow's research, due to both his sampling procedure

and his data collection method.

Maslow sought to apply his Theory of Human Motivation and Self-Actualization to the whole of human experience. That he almost totally omitted women from examination casts grave doubts on its applicability to and representativeness of the human condition. The perceptions of male informants cannot be accepted as representative of the entire culture (Frisbie, 1980). Despite Maslow's frequent allusions to the self-actualizing 'person,' his conceptualization of the issue and his methods clearly frame that 'person' in a masculist mode.

The interpretation Malsow gives his results fashions a model in which male values and male experiences dominate. The effect of this is to lead women to believe that their self-actualization is prescribed by sex-role fulfillment or sex-role denial. It leads men to devalue the experiences of hearth and home. It denies both sexes participation in the full range of human expressions.

Maslow's Theory of Human Motivation and Self-Actualization is predicated on androcentric bias. It derives from the masculist perspective and, as such, does not integrate the female life experience.

Of particular interest to feminism/science are the affiliation, self-esteem, and self-actualization needs of Maslow's hi-

erarchy. Although Maslow states that the individual moves back and forth among these needs as they become more or less potent, he definitely implies a value scale to the differing needs, i.e., the self-esteem need is on a higher plane than the affiliation need, and the self-actualizing need is on a still higher level than the self-esteem need.

This prepotency configuration matches male behavior (a boy joins the team, then aims to be high-scorer, then aims to do his personal best), but one questions its applicability to the female experience. The female socialization process has placed tremendous emphasis on the love, affection, and belongingness needs. While the attainment and satisfaction of these needs may be important to men, the maintenance of these needs is of critical importance to women. A woman's entire sense of self and fulfillment historically have been tied to her needs for affiliation and intimacy (Hyde & Rosenberg, 1980; Miller, 1976).

Contrast this with Maslow's description of the esteem needs:

> These are, first, the desire for strength, for achievement, for adequacy, for mastery and competence, for confidence in the face of the world, and for independence and freedom. Second, we have what we may call

> the desire for reputation or prestige,...status, fame and glory, dominance, recognition, attention, importance, dignity, or appreciation. (Maslow, 1970, p 45)

The descriptors clearly are drawn from the masculist perspective. If Maslow deems this need as a notch above the affiliation needs, then one is prompted to question why males attach such importance to the pursuit of reputation and prestige, fame and glory?

Certainly for women who judge their development on male terms and who value success in a male world Maslow's hierarchy of needs is suitable. Research has shown that women who describe themselves as having non-traditional sex-role values score higher on self-actualization measures (Erb, 1976).

The feminist perspective might incorporate the affiliation need as one in significance and importance with the self-esteem need. It is through this need for affiliation, affection, intimacy, and belonging that the female in the context of the female experience feels worth and fulfillment.

Gilligan's work on women's conception of self and morality (1977) provides insight into women's development. She contends that the feminist construction of the moral domain represents a different reality than that of the masculist view (Gilligan, 1977). "The conventions that shape women's moral judgments differ from those that apply to men" (Gilligan, 1977, p. 492).

Such a view of women's moral development provides a parallel with women's personology. If women bring to the life cycle a different point of view and order human experience in terms of different priorities from males (Gilligan, 1979), it is entirely possible that the affiliative and self-esteem needs for females are not at all comparable to those of males.

This desire for affiliation has been alternately viewed as both a fundamental strength and the source of women's subservience to men (Gould & Wartofsky, 1976; Miller, 1976). That it has both positive and negative aspects does not mitigate against the fact that this need is felt by women and often has worked to men's benefit (literally, not generically). It is a cyclical argument which has yet to be resolved. Altruism implies a disregard for self and a subversion of one's own interests (Gould & Wartofsky, 1976). Yet such self-sacrifice and caring carries with it enormous self-worth and self-satisfaction.

Miller (1976), in her parallel to Maslow's opus, writes in Toward a New Psychology of Women:

> (T)he parameters of the female's development are not the same as the male's and...the same terms do not apply. Women can be highly developed and still give great weight to affiliation. (p 86)

Such a perspective calls for a different theory of motivation, one which speaks to, listens to, and draws from women's needs for affiliations and attachments.

One other area that we will discuss in terms of androcentric bias are some of the actual characteristics of the self-actualizing person as set forth by Maslow. Some of these are exhibited in the behavior of both males and females, such as: creativity, sense of humor, freshness of appreciation, peak experiences, problem-centering, and compassion. Those elements most in contention with the female experience deal with: autonomy; individuation; independence of physical and social environment; less need for involved inter-personal relationships; freedom from confusion, conflict, and inconsistency in ethical dealings; fixation on ends rather than means; and resistance to enculturation (Maslow, 1970).

The Personal Orientation Inventory, an instrument developed by Shostrom to measure the potential for or levels of self-actualization, has been shown to place strong emphasis on individuation, autonomy, inner-support, inner-directedness, and overt expression, rather than inner experience (Coan, 1978).

Research has shown that women place greater emphasis on communion, i.e., the individual living within a community of others; while men are more inclined toward agency, i e., concern with the

individual (Donelson & Gullahorn, 1977). These agentic (self-oriented) or communal (other-directed) orientations have been labeled masculine or feminine (Bem, 1978). Empathy, the importance of intimacy, relationships, and caring are essential to a woman's definition of self (Gilligan, 1979). The behaviors/attitudes determined by Maslow to be characteristic of the self-actualizing personality have little relevance to the female world.

Women place emphasis on attachment, responsibility for and toward others, intimacy, connections, mergers. Their ego boundaries are much more flexible than are men's (Gilligan, 1979). Women are not autonomous but other-directed, seeking to promote conciliations, cohesiveness, and cooperation. This is in stark contrast to Maslow's self-actualizing person.

Research on women's and men's friendships indicates that, although there are many more similarities than dissimilarities, female friendships emphasize reciprocity, i.e., helping, emotional support, and confiding. They engender interaction at an emotional level (Wright, 1982). Contrast this to Maslow's self-actualizer who is far less dependent, far more autonomous, self-directed, and less needful of the praise and attention of others. "Far from needing other people, growth-motivated people may actually be hampered by them" (Maslow, 1968, p.34).

Gilligan's (1979) work on moral development in women addresses women's conflict in ethical/moral decisions:

> Sensitivity to the needs of others and the assumption of responsibility for taking care lead women to attend to voices other than their own and to include in their judgment other points of view. (p 440)

This position engenders confusion and ambivalence in women, rather than the freedom from conflict and inconsistency in ethical dealings of Maslow's self-actualizer.

Women and men are subjected to myriad socializing influences, but it is women who historically have been cast in the subordinate role. The effects of enculturation, of living in a sexist society, manifest themselves in women's behaviors, attitudes, and values. Ongoing research in feminism/science is attempting to catalog for society the pervasive effects this socialization process has had on the female consciousness.

An Alternate View of Female Self-Actualization

The lives of women and men are intricately meshed, "yet they are so different as to entail two separate realities: patriarchal perspective and feminist consciousness" (Ruth, 1980, p. 86). Maslow has suppled us with the patriarchal view. An

alternate view of female self-actualization might be found by looking outside the mainstream of patriarchal society. As such, we present two different female enclaves which established communities consistent with their convictions and ideals: the academic colony of faculty women at Wellesley, 1875-1920 (Palmieri, 1981), and the Sanctified Band of Belton, Texas, 1866-1899 (Shakeshaft, in press).

In Palmieri's extensive historiological study of the Wellesley academic community from 1875 to 1920, a portrait emerges of a group of highly intelligent, public-serving, self-sacrificing, compassionate, intimate, and other-directed women. At the same time these women were rebellious, activist, strong-willed, physical, forceful, and dynamic. This blend of qualities sustained and fortified this colony of academic women and forged an "Adamless Eden" (Palmieri, 1981, p.481). Within this enclave, mentor-disciple relationships flourished, deep emotional bonds and companionate relationships formed, social activism was encouraged, and professional associations developed.

The women at Wellesley were committed to their "family fellowship" (Palmieri, 1981, p. 463).

> They formed a community whose symbols were respect for learning, love of nature, devotion to social

> activism, a fondness for wit and humor, frequent emotional exchanges(,) and loyalty to Wellesley and each other. (Palmieri, 1981, p. 463).

Commitment to group and community was the hallmark of their collective life.

The Sanctified Band of Belton Texas from 1866 to 1899 was another female communal experience. This feminist-separatist commune adhered to the injunction of St. Paul to depart from the unsanctified. Women whose husbands were intemperate, physically abusive, and profligate sought to live their own lives free from the tyranny imposed by their spouses (Shakeshaft, in press).

The Band grew and consolidated into separate living quarters. Shakeshaft, in her research on the Band, explains this consolidation as the formation of "safe houses." Once the houses were established, a shift in objectives occurred.

> (T)he religious calling that once was the reason for their existence as a sect ceased to be the guiding force of the group (and was) replaced by the goal of economic and philosophic independence. (Shakeshaft, in press)

These women, victimized and ostracized by their families, shouldered the burden of economic self-sufficiency by taking in laundry, selling firewood, and, finally, by owning and operating

a hotel. Despite overwhelming obstacles, these women "took on the hard life, humbled themselves, and built a better world to live in" (Shakeshaft, in press).

The women of the Belton commune encouraged self-identity while reaffirming group ties; lived the collective life offering support and nurturance to one another; made group decisions; and sought to provide for the spiritual, emotional, and financial well-being of each of them. In the face of enormous familial and societal pressures, these women maintained the integrity of their lives with great self-discipline and courage.

Both the academic colony at Wellesley and the Sanctified Band of Belton, Texas were removed from the patriarchy. Their values centered on group commitment and dependency, nurturance, affiliations, mutual support, and emotional maintenance. At the same time they encouraged the development of self and of individual talents. The emphasis was on empathy, the ability to feel and act for others with others. Within these female worlds, women grew and fulfilled themselves on their own terms, free from masculist subordination. These microcosms provide us an alternate view of female self-actualization; women being and becoming in their unique ways.

A Feminist Afterword

Maslow's Theory of Human Motivation and Self-Actualization has been criticized in the annals of patriscience for lacking experimental validity. Other researchers have felt that Maslow's theory and hierarchy overestimate the prepotency feature, underestimate individual differences, and oversimplify the concept of need satisfaction (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1980).

This paper has found Maslow's theory and framework to be imbalanced, inaccurate, stereotypic, and not comprehensive in terms of the female experience. His almost exclusive use of androcentric norms, values, attitudes, and behaviors; male subjects; sexist language; and masculist theoretical formulations renders a masculine discourse which "expresses, describes, and provides the working concepts and vocabulary for a landscape in which women are strangers" (Smith, 1979, pp. 137,138).

Of great concern to feminism/science are the subsequent research models and assumptions generated by primary research which is androcentrically biased. Maslow's work has given rise to countless studies, dissertations, articles, books, psychotherapies, and self-improvement courses which serve to perpetuate a view of the world which for women is distorted, inappropriate, and misrepresentative.

Feminism/science must seek to generate new data, broaden and

alter traditional theories to include a feminist perspective, and create new theories which reflect the reality of all life (Parlee, 1979). Such an alternative strategy will make significant changes in the scientific process. It will birth new systems of knowledge which apply to the "total range of human behaviors" (Prescott, 1978, p. 903) and will truly be expressive of human nature.

References

Adkison, J. Women in school administration: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, Fall 1981, 51 (3), 311-343.

Bem, S.L. Beyond androgyny: Some presumptuous prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. In J.A. Sherman & F.L. Denmark (Eds.), The psychology of women: Future directions in research. New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc., 1978.

Bernard, J. The female world. New York: The Free Press, 1981.

Bogdan, R. The soft side of hard data: Education statistics as a human process. Phi Delta Kappa, 1980, 61 (6), 411-412.

Campbell, P.B. The impact of societal biases on research methods. (Contract No. NIE P-79-0120). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, February 1981.

Coan, R.W. Review: The personal orientation inventory. In O.K. Buros (Ed.), The eighth mental measurements yearbook. New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1978.

Covin, T.M. (Ed.). Readings in human development. New York: MSS Information Corporation, 1974.

Donelson, E. & Gullahorn, J.E. Women: A psychological perspective. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1977.

Eichler, M. The double standard. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Eisner, E.W. On the differences between scientific and artistic approaches to qualitative research. Educational Researcher, 1981, 10 (4), 5-9.

Erb, M.E. Toward woman's fuller humanness: Self-actualization of women as related to sex-role values, psychological qualities, and relationships (Doctoral dissertation, California, School of Professional Psychology, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 4451B-4452B. (University Microfilms No. 7732472)

Frick, W.B. Humanistic psychology: Interviews with Maslow, Murphy, and Rogers. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.

Frisbie, C.J. Anthropological approaches to the subordination of women. In S. Cox, Female psychology: The emerging self. Palo Alto, California: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1976.

Gilligan, C. In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and of morality. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 47 (4), 481-517.

Gilligan, C. Woman's place in man's life cycle. Harvard Educational Review, 1979, 49 (4), 431-446.

Goble, F.G. The third force. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1970.

Gould, C.C., & Wartofsky, M.W. (Eds.). Women and philosophy. New York: Capricorn Books, 1976.

Hall, M.H. A conversation with Abraham H. Maslow, President of the American Psychological Association. Psychology Today, 1968, 2 (2), 35-37, 54-57.

Heckerman, C.L. The evolving female. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1980.

Hyde, J.S., & Rosenberg, B.G. Half the human experience. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1980.

Intriligator, B., & Haas, T. The impact of sexism in leadership theory. Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Conference on Women in Education, Washington, D.C., October 1981.

James, E.T., James, J.W., & Boyer, P.S. (Eds.). Notable American women (vol. I, A-F). Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1971.

Janeway, E. Man's world, woman's place: A study in social mythology. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1971.

Kanter, R.M. Women and the structure of organizations. In M. Millman & R.M. Kanter (Eds.), Another voice. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1975.

Kanter, R.M. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977.

Kaplan, A. The conduct of inquiry. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Lowry, R.J. (Ed.). Dominance, self-esteem, self-actualization: Germinal papers of A.H. Maslow. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1973.

Maddi, S., & Costa, P. Humanism in personality: Allport, Maslow, and Murphy. Chicago, IL: Aldine-Atherton, Inc., 1972.

Maslow, A.H. Motivation and personality (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Maslow, A.H. Some fundamental questions that face the normative social psychologist. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1968, 8 (2), 143-153.

Maslow, A.H. Self-actualizing people: A study of psychological health. In R.J. Lowry (Ed.), Dominance, self-esteem, self-actualization: Germinal papers of A.H. Maslow. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1973.

Miller, J.B. Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press, 1976.

Palmieri, P.A. In Adamless Eden: A social portrait of the academic community of Wellesley College 1875-1920. Paper presented at Hofstra University School of Education Colloquium, New York, February 1981.

Parker, S., & Parker, H. The myth of male superiority: Rise and demise. American Anthropologist, 1979, 81 (2), 289-309.

Parlee, M.B. Psychology and women. Signs, 1979, 5 (1), 121-133.

Prescott, S. Why researchers don't study women. Sex Roles, 1978, 4 (6), 899-906.

Reinharz, S. On becoming a social scientist. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Publishers, 1979.

Ruth, S. Issues in feminism. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1980.

Segerberg, M. Re/de/e/volving: Feminist theories of science. Off Our Backs, March 1979, 9, 12-23.

Sergiovanni, T.J., & Carver, F.D. The new school executive: A theory of administration (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1980.

Shakeshaft, C.S. Dissertation research on women in educational administration: A synthesis of findings and a paradigm for future research (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 40, 6455-A. (University Microfilms No. 8011994)

Shakeshaft, C. A feminist critique of feminist research in educational administration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Shakeshaft, C. Herland on the frontier: A woman's community in Texas, 1866-1899. In B. Taylor & M. Bolsteri (Eds.), Women of the south. University of Tennessee Press, in press.

Sherman, J.A., & Beck, E.T. (Eds.). The prism of sex. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1979.

Sherman, J.A., & Denmark, F.L. (Eds.). The psychology of women: Future directions in research. New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc., 1978.

Slocum, S. Woman the gatherer: Male bias in anthropology. In S. Ruth, Issues in feminism. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1980.

Smith, D.E. A sociology for women. In J.A. Sherman & E.T. Beck (Eds.), The prism of sex. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1979.

Stewart, J. Understanding women in organizations: Toward a reconstruction of organizational theory. Administration Science Quarterly, 1978, 336-350.

Stockard, J., & Johnson, M.M. The social origins of male dominance. Sex Roles, 1979, 5, 199-218.

Tietze, I.N., Shakeshaft, C., & Davis, B.H. Sexism in texts in educational administration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

Vaughter, R.M. Psychology. Signs, 1976, 2 (1), 120-146.

Wallston, B.S. What are the questions in psychology of women? A feminist approach to research. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1981, 5 (4), 597-617.

Westkott, M. Feminist criticism of the social sciences. Harvard Educational Review, 1979, 49 (4), 422-430.

Willer, J. The social determination of knowledge. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Williams, J.H. Psychology of women. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1977.

Wright, P. Men's friendships and women's friendships and the alleged inferiority of the latter. Sex Roles, 1982, 8 (1), 1-20.